

PATENT

REMARKSDISCUSSION OF SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to correct typographical informalities. Applicant respectfully requests acceptance of the amended specification because no substantive new matter has been added.

DISCUSSION OF CLAIMS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-16, 20, 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,534,016 to Boute. In the Office Action, claims 33-42 are allowed over the prior art of record. In the Office Action, claims 2-6, 17-19, 21, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response thereto, claims 1, 16, 22, 26, and 30 have been cancelled and claims 2, 6-8, 11-14, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 31, and 32 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 2-15, 17-21, 23-25, 27-29, and 31-42 and are now pending. Following is a discussion of the patentability of each of the pending claims.

Independent Claim 2

In the Office Action, claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 3-15

Claims 3-15 depend from claim 2 and are similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

PATENT

Independent Claim 17

In the Office Action, claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 16. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 18-21, 23, and 24

Claims 18-21, 23, and 24 depend from claim 17 and are similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 25

For at least the same reasons for finding claims 2 and 17 allowable, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 27-29

Claims 27-29 depend from claim 25 and are similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 32

In the Office Action, claim 32 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 32 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 30. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 32 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claim 31

Claim 31 depends from claim 32 and is similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

PATENT

Independent Claim 33 and Dependent Claims 34-42

Claim 33-42 are allowed over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above claim amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

7/9/04

Date

Ronald S. Tamura

Ronald S. Tamura, Reg. No. 43,179
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Pacesetter, Inc.
15900 Valley View Court
Sylmar, CA 91392-9221
818/493-3157
818/362-4795 (fax)